

## REMARKS

Claim 27 is cancelled. Claims 5 and 17 were previously canceled. Hence, Claims 1-4, 6-16, 18-26 and 28-30 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed June 11, 2010 are addressed hereinafter.

### I. ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART

#### a. CLAIMS 13-16 AND 18 -- 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. (Office Action, pages 3-4) Applicants believe that the rejection is fully addressed in amended Claim 13. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### b. CLAIMS 11-13 -- 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. (Office Action; page 2) Applicants believe that the rejection is fully addressed in amended Claims 11 and 13. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### c. CLAIM 17 -- 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. (Office Action: page 3) Claim 17 was canceled in one of the previous replies submitted by the applicants. Hence, the rejection is moot.

### II. ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

#### A. CLAIMS 1-4, 6-16 AND 18-30 — 35 U.S.C. § 103(e): PFITZNER, AMIN

Claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pfitzner et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,506,069 (“Pfitzner”) in view of Amin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,854,014 (“Amin”). (Office Action, page 4) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

## CLAIM 1

Support for the amendment is provided at least in original Claim 2 and at least paragraphs

[25] and [05] of the applicants' specification.

Present Claim 1 recites generating an authentication, authorization and access (AAA) request ... comprising a requesting network access device description and a plurality of service requests. The service requests indicate the computer services for which the requesting network access device requests provisioning. The requesting network access device description includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version. The AAA request is a RADIUS packet, which comprises VSA blocks. The requesting network access device description is stored in the VSA blocks of the RADIUS packets.

It is well founded that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the references cited and relied upon must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. In addition, a sufficient factual basis to support the obviousness rejection must be proffered. *In re Freed*, 165 USPQ 570 (CCPA 1970); *In re Warner*, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967); *In re Lunsford*, 148 USPQ 721 (CCPA 1966).

Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not described or suggested by Pfitzner and Amin, individually or in combination. For example, Pfitzner and Amin fail to describe or suggest that the requesting network access device description, including one or more of the device vendor, the device type and the device version, is stored in the VSA blocks within a RADIUS packet containing the AAA request, as claimed.

Addressing Claim 2, the Office Action acknowledges that Pfitzner and Amin fail to describe that the AAA request is a RADIUS access request. (Office Action: page 14) However, the Action alleges that, in column 10 (ll. 20-31), Anderson discloses a RADIUS request containing the AAA request, as recited in Claim 1. (Office Action: page 14) This is incorrect because Anderson's RADIUS request contains no information about a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type or a requesting network access device version, as claimed. In column 10 (ll. 20-31), Anderson describes that a client that initiates a session with a service provider supplies to the provider the service login identifier and the

client's password. However, Anderson does not describe that Anderson's RADIUS processor receives or retrieves a description of the requesting network access device, as recited in Claim 1. Further, Anderson does not describe that Anderson's RADIUS processor receives, processes or transmit RADIUS packets containing the information about the description of the requesting network access device, as claimed. In particular, Anderson does not describe a RADIUS packet that contains the description of the requesting network access device stored in the VSA blocks of the RADIUS packet, as recited in Claim 1.

The RADIUS packets described in Anderson are conventional RADIUS packets that merely contain authentication information, which the RADIUS processor uses to authenticate the client. The client's authentication information described in Anderson includes the client's specific information, such as the client's password, the client's service login ID. However, in the conventional RADIUS protocol, RADIUS packets do not contain a description of the device vendor information, the device type information or the device version information of the requesting network access devices, as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to implement the use of RADIUS requests into Pfitzner as taught by Anderson because doing so would make the method and system more secure. (Office Action: page 14) This is incorrect because neither Pfitzner nor Anderson discloses or suggests carrying a RADIUS packet, the requesting network access device description, which includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version, as claimed. Even in combination, Pfitzner, Amin and Anderson do not provide the claimed approach. Hence, no combination of Pfitzner, Amin and Anderson would have provided all features that are recited in Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIMS 11, 13, 19 AND 23

Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 recite features similar to those in Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 are patentable over Pfitzner for the same reasons as for Claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 2-4, 12, 14-16 AND 24-26— 35 U.S.C. § 103(e): PFITZNER, AMIN,  
ANDERSON

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly anticipated by Pfitzner et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,506,069 (“Pfitzner”) in view of Amin and in further view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,089,316 (“Anderson”). (Office Action: page 10) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 depend from Claims 1, 11, 13, 19 and 23, respectively. Claim 1 (11, 13, 19 and 23, respectively) recites at least one feature that is not disclosed in Pfitzner and Amin, individually or in combination. Further, Anderson does not cure the deficiencies of Pfitzner and Amin with respect to Claim 1 (11, 13, 19 and 23). Therefore, and due to claim dependency, Pfitzner, Amin and Anderson, individually or in combination, fail to describe or suggest the whole subject matter recited in Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: September 10, 2010

/Malgorzata A Kulczycka#50496/  
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka  
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110  
Telephone: (408) 414-1228  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076